



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,414	03/31/2001	Scott Cordner	0325.00459	3236
21363	7590	11/06/2003	EXAMINER	
CHRISTOPHER P. MAIORANA, P.C. 24025 GREATER MACK SUITE 200 ST. CLAIR SHORES, MI 48080				DANG, KHANH NMN
3		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
2181				

DATE MAILED: 11/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/823,414	CORDNER, SCOTT
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Khanh Dang	2181

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-12 are directed to an apparatus. However, the essential structural cooperative relationships between elements recited in the claims have been omitted, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

It is unclear what may be the subject matter of claim 11. It is clear from independent claim 1 that the so-called "response" is from the "interface circuit."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-8, 10-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Silverman et al.

At the outset, it is noted that similar claims will be grouped together to avoid repetition in explanation.

As broadly drafted, these claims do not define any structure/step that differs from Silverman et al. With regard to claims 1, 2, and 12, Silverman et al. discloses an apparatus for coupling a peripheral device to a host comprising: an interface circuit (comprising a SIE 206 and USB Interface 204) configured to receive a request from the host (also "host" in Silverman et al.) and present a response to the host; and a logic circuit (it is clear that in Silverman et al., USB logic according to standard USB Specification is used since the device of Silver man is a USB device) configured to generate said response when the request is serviceable by the apparatus or pass the request to an external circuit (208, for example) when the request is not serviceable by the apparatus. See also Figs. 3 and 4 and description thereof.

With regard to claims 3 and 4, it is clear that the external circuit optionally comprises an ASIC. With regard to claim 5, it is clear that the apparatus comprises a universal serial bus (USB) peripheral device (also "peripheral" in Silverman).

With regard to claim 6, the logic circuit (see above) is configured to generate the response to the request using information received from the external circuit (208, for example). See also Figs. 3 and 4 and description thereof).

With regard to claim 7, it is clear that the USB device of Silverman must strictly adhere to USB Protocol set forth in the standard USB Specification. Therefore, a descriptor table must be used in Silverman et al.

With regard to claim 8, it is clear that the USB device of Silverman must strictly adhere to USB Protocol set forth in the standard USB Specification. Therefore, an enumeration request must be performed in Silverman et al.

With regard to claim 10, it is clear from Silverman that the logic circuit (see above) is configured to pass to the external circuit (208) a request selected from the group consisting of a class request, a vendor request, a custom driver request, and requests implemented to support USB specification changes and enhancements.

With regard to claim 11, as best the Examiner can ascertain from the language of the claim, the USB device of Silverman must strictly adhere to USB Protocol set forth in the standard USB Specification. Therefore, the response from the USB interface circuit must comprise a so-called ‘stall’ signal.

With regard to claims 13-20, it is clear that one using the apparatus of Silvarman et al. would have performed the same steps set forth in claims 13-20. Note also that the so-called “response” can be passed either directly from the Silverman et al.’s interface circuit or from Silverman et al.’s external circuit.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silverman et al.

Silverman et al., as explained above, discloses the claimed invention. However, Silverman does not disclose that the USB "request" conforms to USB 2.0 (chapter 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to upgrade the USB system of Silverman et al. from USB 1.0 to USB 2.0, since the Examiner takes Official Notice that the use of USB 2.0 is old and well-known; and upgrading the USB system of Silverman et al. from USB 1.0 to USB 2.0 only involves ordinary skill in the art for the purpose of increasing the data transfer speed, for example. If the Applicants choose to challenge the fact that USB 2.0 is old and well-known, supportive document(s) will be provided upon request.

US. Patent Nos. 6,629,169 to Chu and 6,389,495 to Larky et al. are cited as relevant art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Khanh Dang at telephone number 703-308-0211.

Khanh Dang

**Khanh Dang
Primary Examiner**